Case 2:15-cv-00089-RSM Document 25 Filed 01/16/15 Page 1 of 5

1	Scott H. Frewing, SBN 191311 BAKER & McKENZIE LLP	DAVID A. HUBBERT Deputy Assistant Attorney General
2	660 Hansen Way	
3	Palo Alto, CA 94304-1044 Telephone: +1.650.856.2400 Facsimile: +1.650 856.9299	NOREENE STEHLIK (DC Bar No. 394479) Senior Litigation Counsel, Tax Division JEREMY HENDON (OR Bar No. 982490)
4	scott.frewing@bakermckenzie.com	AMY MATCHISON (CA Bar No. 217022) Trial Attorneys, Tax Division
5	James M. O'Brien (<i>Pro Hac Vice</i>) BAKER & McKENZIE LLP	U.S. Department of Justice P.O. Box 683, Ben Franklin Station
6	300 East Randolph Street, Suite 5000	Washington, DC 20044-0683 Email: Noreene.C.Stehlik@usdoj.gov
7	Chicago, IL 60601 Telephone: +1.312.861.8602 Facsimile: +1.312.698.2323	Jeremy.Hendon@usdoj.gov
8	james.m.o'brien@bakermckenzie.com	Amy.T.Matchison@usdoj.gov Western.TaxCivil@usdoj.gov
9	Attorneys for Respondent	Telephone: (202) 514-6489 (202) 353-2466
10	WILLIAM L. VEGHTE	(202) 307-6422
11	Daniel A Rosen (<i>Pro Hac Vice</i>) BAKER & McKENZIE LLP	MELINDA L. HAAG Northern District of California
12	452 Fifth Avenue New York, NY 10018	United States Attorney
13	Telephone: 212 626 4272 Facsimile: 212 310 1672	Attorneys for Petitioner THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
14	daniel.rosen@bakermckenzie.com	
15	Attorneys for Proposed Intervenor MICROSOFT CORPORATION	
16		
17	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
18	NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
19	SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION	
20		
21	UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,) Case No. 14-CV-5565 (JST)
22	Petitioner,	STIPULATION AND [PROPOSED] ORDER TO TRANSFER ACTION TO
23	V.	THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE WESTERN
24	WILLIAM L. VEGHTE,	DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
25	Respondent.))
26)
27		<i>1</i>
28		

Petitioner United States, Respondent William Veghte ("Veghte"), and Proposed Intervenor Microsoft Corporation ("Microsoft") (collectively, the "Parties") by and through the undersigned counsel, hereby enter into this Stipulation and [Proposed] Order to Transfer Action to the United States District Court for the Western District of Washington pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1404(a) with reference to the following facts:

Whereas on December 11, 2014, Petitioner initiated an action against Microsoft in the United States District Court for the Western District of Washington to enforce a "designated" summons served on Microsoft in connection with the Internal Revenue Service's ("IRS") examination of Microsoft's 2004 through 2006 taxable years;

Whereas, the IRS has issued additional "related" summonses that "relate[] to the same return as such designated summons";

Whereas, to date, the IRS has issued eighteen such "related" summonses to Microsoft, third-party recordkeepers, current employees, and former employees, including Respondent. All of the "related" summonses seek documents and testimony in connection with Microsoft's 2004 through 2006 audit;

Whereas, to date, Petitioner has filed twelve enforcement actions with respect to the "related" summonses, ten of which are pending in the United States District Court for the Western District of Washington;

Whereas, all of the "related" enforcement actions pending in the United States District Court for the Western District of Washington, in addition to *United States v. Microsoft Corp.*, 2:14-mc-00117-RSM, are pending before the Honorable Ricardo S. Martinez;

Whereas, the enforcement actions pending in the United States District Court for the Western District of Washington and this action involve numerous common questions of law and fact, including but not limited to, Respondent's and Microsoft's defenses to enforcement;

Whereas, on December 22, 2014, Petitioner initiated this action by filing a Petition to Enforce Internal Revenue Service Summons (DE 1) in the United States District Court for the Northern District of California to enforce the "related" summons against Respondent, Microsoft's

former employee who worked at Microsoft's headquarters in Redmond, Washington during the Microsoft audit years and now resides in the Northern District of California;

Whereas, on December 30, 2014, counsel for Respondent conferred with counsel for Petitioner regarding Respondent's desire to move to transfer this action to the United States District Court for the Western District of Washington in light of the ten other actions to enforce "related" summons pending in that district, along with the underlying action to enforce the "designated" summons that is also pending in that district;

Whereas, on December 30, 2014, Microsoft filed a Motion to Intervene in this action, on the grounds that 26 U.S.C. § 7609(b)(1) provides Microsoft with an unconditional right to intervene;

Whereas, on January 7, 2015, Petitioner filed a statement of non-opposition to Microsoft's motion to intervene;

Whereas, Microsoft has filed motions to intervene in the nine other pending actions in which it is not a named party, and the United States has filed statements of non-opposition in each of those cases;

Whereas, Microsoft has also filed motions to consolidate the cases pending in the United States District Court for the Western District of Washington with the action to enforce the "designated" summons;

Whereas, Microsoft and the United States have reached an agreement on consolidating the cases currently pending in the United States District Court for the Western District of Washington, as reflected in a stipulated motion filed on January 13, 2015;

Whereas, on January 12, 2015, counsel for Petitioner informed counsel for Respondent that it would consent to transfer this action to the United States District Court for the Western District of Washington pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1404(a);

Whereas, the Parties believe that transferring this action to the United States District Court for the Western District of Washington so that this case, along with the twelve other actions, may be heard by a single judge to ensure that the relevant issues are disposed of consistently in the multiple enforcement actions;

Whereas, the United States District Court for the Western District of Washington has subject matter jurisdiction over this action pursuant to 26 U.S.C. § 7402(a) and 28 U.S.C. § 1345;

Whereas, the United States District Court for the Western District of Washington has personal jurisdiction over the Parties because Petitioner is the Government, Microsoft's principal place of business is in the state of Washington, and Respondent hereby consents to personal jurisdiction in the state of Washington solely for purposes of this action;

Whereas, venue would be proper in the United States District Court for the Western District of Washington because the Parties expressly consent to venue in that district;

Whereas, if this Court issues the requested order transferring this action to the United States District Court for the Western District of Washington, Microsoft and the United States would move to consolidate this case with the other summons enforcement actions pending in that district before the Honorable Ricardo S. Martinez

Whereas, Respondent and Microsoft enter into this stipulation and agreement on the condition that it will not have any prejudicial effect on any kind or type whatsoever on their rights, including but not limited to arguments, affirmative defenses, legal theories, or any other rights. To be clear, this Stipulation relates solely to transferring the venue of this action in order to streamline the proceedings, conserve judicial and party resources, and avoid inconsistent orders;

Now, therefore, good cause appearing, the Parties hereby stipulate and respectfully request the Court enter an order transferring this action to the United States District Court for the Western District of Washington pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1404(a) for the convenience of the parties and in the interest of justice. All signatories listed, and on whose behalf the filing is submitted, including that below, concur in the filing's content and have authorized the filing.

Case 2:15-cv-00089-RSM Document 25 Filed 01/16/15 Page 5 of 5

1	Dated: January 15, 2015 Respectfully submitted,	
2		
3	By: /s/	
4	NOREENE STEHLIK	
5	Trial Attorney U.S. Department of Justice	
6	Attorneys for Respondent	
7 8	THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA	
9	Dated: January 15, 2015 Respectfully submitted,	
10		
11	By: /s/	
12	Scott H. Frewing BAKER & McKENZIE LLP	
13	Attorneys for Petitioner WILLIAM L. VEGHTE	
14	WILLIAM L. VEOITE	
15		
16	Pursuant to General Order No. 45, Section X(B), Scott H. Frewing hereby attests that the	
17	signatory's concurrence in the filing of this document has been obtained.	
18 19	[PROPOSED] ORDER	
20	Based upon the foregoing Stipulation and good cause appearing, IT IS SO ORDERED:	
21	1. This action is transferred to the United States District Court for the Western District	
22	of Washington pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1404(a) for the convenience of the parties and in the interest	
23	of justice.	
24	Dated: January <u>16,</u> 2015	
25	IT IS SO ORDERED	
2627	Urite On A. 43	
28	Judge Jon S. Tigar	
zie LLP Way 94304	Case No. 44 V 5565 (JST) STIPULATION TO TRANSFER ACKORTS USDC - WESTERN DISCORD WASHINGTON	
2400	DISTRICT OF	

Baker & McKenzie LLF 660 Hansen Way Palo Alto, CA 94304 +1 650 856 2400